

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

**EIDOS DISPLAY, LLC, EIDOS III,  
LLC,**

**Plaintiffs,**

V.

**CHI MEI INNOLUX CORPORATION,  
CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS USA,  
INC.,**

**Defendants.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:11-CV-00201-JRG**

## VERDICT FORM

In answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's charge. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below. As used herein, "Plaintiffs" or "Eidos" means Plaintiffs Eidos Display, LLC and Eidos III LLC. As used herein, "Defendants" or "Innolux" means Defendants Chi Mei Innolux Corporation and Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc. As used herein, "the '958 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 5,879,958.

**QUESTION 1**

Did Eidos prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Innolux has directly infringed Claim 1 of the '958 patent?

Answer "Yes" or "No" in the space provided.

Answer: Yes

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTION ONLY IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED YES TO QUESTION 1. OTHERWISE, DO NOT ANSWER THIS QUESTION.

**QUESTION 2**

Did Eidos prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Innolux willfully infringed the '958 patent?

Answer "Yes" or "No" in the space provided.

Answer: Yes

**QUESTION 3**

Did Innolux prove by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 1 of the '958 patent is invalid for lack of written description or enablement?

Answer "Yes" or "No" in the space provided.

Answer:       No

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTION ONLY IF YOU HAVE  
ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION 1 AND "NO" FOR QUESTION 3.

**QUESTION 4**

What sum of money, if any, now paid in cash, has Eidos proven by a  
preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate Eidos for  
damages resulting from Innolux's direct infringement of the '958 patent?

Answer in dollars and cents:

Amount: \$ 4,100,000.00

Date: June 30, 2017